

Reply to Office Action dated February 11, 2008

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-14 and 16-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification, claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13-14, 16-17 and 19-22 are amended and claims 3 and 15 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Office Action's indication that claims 21-22 are allowed and that claims 3-7, 10-12, 15 and 18-19 contain allowable subject matter. Features of allowable dependent claim 3 are incorporated into independent claim 1 and features of allowable dependent claim 15 are incorporated into independent claim 14. Thus, each of independent claims 1 and 14 defines patentable subject matter.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 8-9, 13-14, 16-17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0138030 to Gavnoudias et al. (hereafter Gavnoudias in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0142726 to Eltavil et al. (hereafter Eltavil). The rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

The applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 9. More specifically, the Office Action asserts that Gavnoudias discloses an index detector for detecting Walsh index indicating maximum Walsh code by calculating an energy of each Walsh code correlation value of signals received via multi-paths. See Gavnoudias' paragraph [0074]. The Office Action also asserts that Gavnoudias discloses a plurality of fingers for receiving the Walsh index generated from the index detector and for compensating the signals received via the

Reply to Office Action dated February 11, 2008

multi-paths, respectively. See Gavnoudias' paragraph [0101]. However, Gavnoudias discloses only compensating for timing, frequency, amplitude, and phase error for each finger using information from parameter estimation, for example low latency information from Pilot Finger. See Gavnoudias' paragraphs [0074] and [0101]. Further, Gavnoudias' FIGs. 5(a) and 5(b) discloses block diagrams of the pilot finger 142. Gavnoudias' paragraph [0093] does not disclose detecting a Walsh index indicating a maximum Walsh code by calculating an energy of each Walsh code correlation value of signals received via multi-paths (to use for compensating the signals received via the multi-paths), as recited in independent claim 9.

Gavnoudias does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 9. Eltavil does not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 9. Thus, independent claim 9 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 13 recites a plurality of fingers for despreading received signals and outputting first outputs corresponding to Walsh code energy values calculated by using a correlation value of each walsh code and the despread signals and second outputs by compensating the correlation value by performing phase estimation filtering for the correlation value according to a control signal, and a combiner for outputting the control signal indicating the walsh code having a maximum energy value of the first outputs to each fingers and a symbol for a walsh code set by combining the second outputs.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 13. More specifically, Gavnoudias (and the other

Reply to Office Action dated February 11, 2008

applied references) does not teach or suggest outputting first outputs corresponding to Walsh code energy values calculated by using a correlation value of each walsh code and the despread signals and second outputs by compensating the correlation value by performing phase estimation filtering for the correlation value according to a control signal. Thus, independent claim 13 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 9, 13, 14 and 21 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 2, 4-14 and 16-22 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. **10/771,338**

Docket No. **K-0605**

Reply to Office Action dated February 11, 2008

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren

Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

Date: May 6, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610